

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/216,378

Applicant(s)

CHAN ET AL.

Examiner

Lun-See Lao

Art Unit

2615

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 11 July 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: _____.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Note the final Office action for the examiner's position. Further, regarding the argument that the final Office action conceded that Lambrecht does not actually teach the built-in microphone (Remarks, page 10), the examiner's position appeared mischaracterized. As discussed in the rejection of claim 1, while Lambrecht does not explicitly teach that the microphone is of a built-in type, Lambrecht teaches the microphone is physically located with the speaker, and the speaker in turn is a conventional speaker (col. 3, lines 48-53). One of ordinary skill in the art would realize that for the PC (notebook computer 154) as shown in figure 1, the speaker would be built into the PC / notebook computer. In other words, the microphone would be built into the PC / notebook computer, to be physically located with the speaker. It is noted that it was what Lambrecht suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art, rather than the explicit teaching of Lambrecht, that was relied upon to show that Lambrecht meets the claimed limitation. Applicant cited Summary of the Invention of Lambrecht (Remarks, pages 11-12). However, Lambrecht clearly stated in the Summary that "[t]he audio signal is output to the listener via a speaker or headphone to accomplish the noise cancellation". In other words, it is the calculation of the software application and the generation of the cancellation signal that provides the cancellation functionality, rather than the locations of the speaker or the microphone. As to the argument that the Lambrecht system, as modified, cannot generate "sufficient volume in free air to overcome the noise", it is noted that the claim language, for example, claim 1, does not require "sufficient volume in free air to overcome the noise". Instead, it only requires "... generates a noise cancellation signal responsive to the detected ambient noise" and "for provision to... to reduce headphone noise". No strength of the noise cancellation signal is claimed. Applicant's argument that McIntosh does not teach detecting ambient noise but the noise that actually penetrates the earcup (rather than sounds that do not enter the earcup) (Remarks, pages 14-16). The examiner's position is that the noise that actually penetrates the earcup (rather than sounds that do not enter the earcup) is the actual ambient noise presented to, and sensed by, a listener because this is almost the only way that any ambient noise is sensed by a listener. Applicant appears to argue that applicant's ambient noise does not include the ambient noise ears that penetrates the earcup. However, such distinction is not claimed. See, for example, claim 1. Regarding applicant's argument that McIntosh does not teach a standard headphone compatible audio output connection (Remarks, pages 17-18), the examiner's position is that the claim language, see, for example, claims 1, 8, 13, 16 and 24, requires audio output connection to be compatible with a standard headphone, which is met by Lambrecht who teaches the output port to the user's headphone, which is certainly compatible with any standard headphone. Whether the headphone connection includes an input, or bidirectional communication, is clearly not recited in the claims. See, for example, claims 1, 8, 13, 16 and 24. For these reasons, applicant's arguments are not persuasive.